

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/079,401
Response dated October 15, 2003
Reply to OA of **July 16, 2003**
Page 9 of 14

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Response, claims 1-10 are being amended to further clarify the present invention. Applicants respectfully believe that no new matter has been added, and that this Response is fully responsive to the non-final Office action mailed **July 16, 2003** (Paper No. 4).

INFORMALITIES

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of an informality on page 23 at line 11, and suggested changing "good" to --defective--. In response, Applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggestion. In addition, the following additional informalities have been corrected: "anvil 19" (p. 17, line 22) was changed to --anvil 17--; "crimping terminal 50" (p. 21, line 6) was changed to --crimping terminal 51--; "and 84c" (p. 29, line 22) was changed to --and 84d--; and "if" (p. 29, line 26) was changed to --If--.

The Examiner objected to claims 4, 6, and 10 because of informalities. In response, Applicants have revised those claims to correct the informalities. In addition, Applicants have amended claims 1-10 to remove other informalities. The phrase "test terminal" is used in the claims 1-10, as amended, in lieu of the phrase "terminal to be tested" in order to improve clarity.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/079,401**
Response dated October 15, 2003
Reply to OA of **July 16, 2003**
Page 10 of 14

Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,937,505 issued to Strong et al. (**Strong ‘505**). Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,197,186 issued to Strong et al. (**Strong ‘186**).

Claims 1, 4, and 6 are amended by this Response. Applicants respectfully believe that claims 1, 4, and 6, as amended, are allowable over **Strong ‘505** and **Strong ‘186** because those references fail to teach or suggest the following features of claims 1, 4, and 6, as amended: “acquiring a reference waveform from a characteristic waveform when a first terminal has been crimped normally, ... reference waveform showing **changes in load corresponding to time elapsed** when the first terminal is crimped normally”.

Strong ‘505 discloses a method of evaluating a crimped electrical connection. The method utilizes a “data base containing upper and lower force values for a set of predetermined distances so as to define a band (envelope) of force measurements within which lie the force measurements of an acceptable crimp” (col. 2, lines 16-20, FIG. 4). The data base of **Strong ‘505** contains data showing the relationship between force applied and linear distance traveled by ram 14, during a crimp operation.

Strong '505 is concerned with distance of ram travel. **Strong '505** is not concerned with an amount of force (or load) that would be expected at a particular moment in **time**. In particular, **Strong '505** relies solely on force data and displacement data, rather than **time** data.

In the last Office action, the Examiner suggested that the data base in **Strong '505** stores data corresponding to the reference waveform set forth in the claims. However, now that claims 1, 4, and 6 have been amended to clarify features related to the Applicants' reference waveform, Applicants respectfully believe that it is even more clear that claims 1, 4, and 6 set forth features not taught or suggested by **Strong '505**.

Strong '186 discloses a method of evaluating a crimped electrical connection. The method utilizes data pairs showing a relationship between force applied and an amount of deformation of a terminal, during a crimp operation (col. 2, lines 60-63).

In the last Office action, the Examiner suggested that the data pairs of **Strong '186** correspond to the reference waveform set forth in the claims. However, now that claims 1, 4, and 6 have been amended to clarify features related to the Applicants' reference waveform, Applicants respectfully believe that it is even more clear that claims 1, 4, and 6 set forth features not taught or suggested by **Strong '186**.

Claims 1, 4, and 6, as amended, further clarify the fact that the reference waveform shows load at different moments of time (see also FIG. 5A). **Strong '505** and **Strong '186**, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the relationship between load and elapsed time, as set forth in the claims 1, 4, and 6, as amended.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-10 depend from claim 1. Therefore, because the cited art fails to teach or suggest features of claims 1, 4, and 6, as amended, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims 1-10, as amended, are allowable over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing amendments to claims 1, 4, and 6, it is respectfully believed that the Examiner would not be able to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness utilizing the references discussed above. Firstly, there is no suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine reference teachings to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention, as set forth in claims 1, 4, and 6, as amended. Secondly, a reasonable expectation of success is absent. Thirdly, the references do not teach or suggest all features set forth in claims 1, 4, and 6, as amended.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, claims 1-10, as amended, are respectfully believed to be in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is respectfully requested.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/951,522
Amendment dated October 15, 2003
Reply to OA of **July 16, 2003**
Page 13 of 14

Two references were listed by the Examiner (Paper No. 4, p. 7) but not applied in any rejections of claims. It is the Applicants' understanding that the Examiner must have considered these references to be no more pertinent than the applied art of record. As recognized by the Examiner, these references fail to teach or suggest the specifically recited features of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully believe that no further comment on these references is necessary at this time.


If the Examiner feels that this application is not currently in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for a telephone conference to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/951,522**
Amendment dated October 15, 2003
Reply to OA of **July 16, 2003**
Page 14 of 14

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP


Darren R. Crew

Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 37,860

DRC/plb/llf

Atty. Docket No. **020217**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE